

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/878,144	06/08/2001	Shlomo Maraglit	11175.22.1	1309	
75	7590 10/19/2004			EXAMINER	
Nydegger & Associates			PAYNE, DAVID C		
348 Olive Street San Diego, CA 92103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2633	
**************************************			DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/878,144	MARAGLIT ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	David C. Payne	2633				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Ju	ıne 2004.					
·	·					
·	<u> </u>					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 2-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 5-13 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/878,144

Art Unit: 2633

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claim 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng US 6,577,421 (Cheng).

Re claim 1.

Cheng disclosed (Figure 1)

A system for directing (e.g., via 56, 80, 50 and 76) a communication light bean from free-space, said system comprising:

A source (70 and 72) for generating a reference light beam with a predetermined spatial relationships with the communication light beam (e.g., alignment information, transmission errors and noise correction, Col. 13, lines 12-30);

an optical fiber having an end (68);

an optical position detector having a target;

an adjustable MEMS mirror (74 and 76 or 48 and 50) for directing the communications light beam toward said end of said optical fiber, and for directing the reference light beam to an incident point on said optical position detector, said optical position detector configured to Application/Control Number: 09/878,144

Art Unit: 2633

generated an error signal indicative of a spatial relationship of the incident point on said optical position detector to the target of said optical position detector; and control system for moving said mirror said response to said error signal to nullify said error signal to direct the communications light beam to a predetermined point of said end of said optical fiber. (52 Figure 2)

Cheng does not disclose the mirror controller as a closed loop servo. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to consider the mirror controller as such given that the processor and controller correct position of the mirror based on error signals which is traditionally understood as a closed loop system.

Re claim 3,

the beams are shown as substantially parallel as can be seen by 44 and 46 of Figure 2.

Re claim 4, lacking any criticality is not considered patentable over the prior art to claim the specific dimensions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to derive optimal parameters for the system.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 5-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2633

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David C. Payne whose telephone number is (571) 272-3024. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7a-4p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dcp

David C. Payne Patent Examiner

AU 2633